

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed March 23, 2006. Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 25-56 are pending in the application with Claims 25, 36, 41, 45 and 48 being in independent form. By the present amendment, Claims 45 and 48 have been amended. No new subject matter has been introduced into the disclosure by way of the present amendment.

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing Claims 25 – 44.

I. Rejection of Claims 45-47 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 36-40 and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentably obvious over Gutenson et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,869,582 issued to Humphrey et al.

Gutenson teaches a service center 32 having a coax gateway, telephone gateway, load center, and control and data communication system. However, there are no indications that multiple connectors for each gateway/system are present. In fact, Gutenson requires a separate coaxial cable splitter 80 to distribute the coaxial signal from the service center 32 to the multiple rooms in the building. (See: Gutenson et al., FIG. 2).

Contrastingly, the electronic information distribution section of Claim 45 contains a plurality of connectors of several types, e.g., coaxial, RJ-45, RJ-11, fiber-optic, etc., as shown in FIG. 3 of the present application. Consequently, Gutenson et al. fails to disclose a panel having an electronic information distribution section including a plurality of groups of connectors, a plurality of groups of connectors, each group of connectors have connectors for multiple connector-types, each group of connectors corresponds to a location in a structure, as recited in Claim 45 and further described in Applicants' disclosure.

Humphrey et al. discloses an intra-building telephone system, which allows assignment of telephone extensions to individual phones from a central telephone patch box. However, Humphrey et al. requires multiple incoming telephone lines equal in number to the number of extensions being assigned.

For the sake of argument, if the splitter 80 of Gutenson et al. were taken as the electronic information distribution section, as asserted in the Office Action, Humphrey et al. would not be applicable in modifying the splitter as the Examiner requires in order to disclose Applicants' recited limitations. A coaxial splitter 80 as known in the art is basically, constructed from several connectors spliced together, such that one connector acts as an input and the remaining connectors act as outputs. (See: RadioShack model no. 15-1234 for an example of a coaxial splitter). The splitter 80 of Gutenson et al. is not suggested to be anything other than this simple type of coaxial splitter nor would a more complex type of device be necessary for the Gutenson et al. system to function as intended.

Consequently, there is no proper motivation to combine Gutenson et al. and Humphrey et al. Therefore, Claims 45-47 are believed patentably distinct and allowable over the cited prior art references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 45 – 47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Gutenson et al. in view of Humphrey et al.

II. Rejection of Claims 48-56 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 48-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentably obvious over Gutenson et al. in view of Applicants' disclosure.

Gutenson et al. fails to disclose an electronic information distribution panel disposed at the first location, the electronic information distribution panel having at least one CAT5 connector, at least one optical fiber cable connector, and at least one RG6 coaxial cable

connector disposed thereon, one of each of the at least one CAT5 connector, at least one optical fiber cable connector, and at least one RG6 coaxial cable connector being arranged in a group corresponding to a location in a structure, as recited in Applicants' amended Claim 48.


Claims 49-56 depend from independent Claim 48 and thus include all the limitations recited in that independent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons given above, Claims 48-56 are believed patentably distinct and allowable over the cited prior art references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 48 – 56 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Gutenson et al. in view of Applicants' disclosure.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 25-56 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Esatto, Jr.
Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza - Ste. 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

PJE:DAT:jam